



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

culture seem not to have been affected by foreign ideas; but by the time of the Twelfth Dynasty we find Egyptian influence forming a natural line of demarcation between the First and Second Semitic periods. During the latter period the Semites of Palestine in their arts and crafts were affected not only by the civilization of Egypt but also by that of Crete, the Ægean regions, and especially by that of Cyprus. The Semites were markedly deficient in creative ability, but they made up for their lack of originality by their capacity for assimilation. In the Third Semitic period, which extended from about the end of the fifteenth century to about 1,000 B.C., "Egyptian and Ægean influence are still discernible, but these influences were rather reminiscent than direct. In the Fourth Semitic period, which is more or less contemporaneous with the Israelite occupation, this tendency becomes even more pronounced, but then fresh imports from Cyprus restore the waning balance of foreign influence in Palestinian culture. The Hellenistic period, which began about 550 B. C. and lasted down to Roman times, is characterized by the influence of Greece and the Greek Islands."

Having thus briefly in his introductory chapter outlined the foreign influences operative during the different periods in Palestine's archæological history, the author gives us a series of monographs on the various arts and crafts as they were developed in these periods. In eight chapters he discusses and illustrates by the aid of over a hundred figures the Caves and Rock-cuttings; Architecture; Flint, Bone, Ivory, and Stone; Metallurgy; Pottery; Terra-cotta; Burial Customs; Worship and Places of Worship. It is all excellently done; but one is somewhat surprised to find, in a study of the Archæology of the Holy Land, the author introducing his own highly modern contempt for a belief in the future life, when he refers to that belief in the present day as held only by the "unsophisticated." We must forgive our author his bad taste and thank him for his work as a valuable addition to our shelf of books really useful to Bible students.

MAX KELLNER.

EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL,
CAMBRIDGE.

A STUDY IN CHRISTOLOGY. HERBERT M. RELTON, D.D. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 1917. Pp. xxxvi, 278. \$2.50.

Dr. Relton's thesis is that the Christology formulated by Leontius of Byzantium in the sixth century is not only the nearest approximation yet made to the solution of what is confessedly an insoluble

problem, but also is capable of restatement in such a way as to bring it into accord with modern psychology. In brief, the theory is that of the "enhypostatic union" of the two natures in Christ; an impersonal human nature finding its hypostasis in the Logos, which performs for the human body every function which would naturally have been performed by a human soul, and exists in such a relationship to the human body as a human soul would have done. This sounds like Apollinarianism, and the author concedes the resemblance, but escapes the imputation of heresy by calling attention to certain elements in the thought of Apollinaris which were insufficiently apprehended when his theory was condemned. The point is that the pre-existent Logos was humanity in its ideal perfection, so that only in its incarnation was humanity found perfect. To put it in more familiar terms: the Logos is the divine ideal of humanity; hence in its complete incarnation there is at once full divinity, because it is the perfect manifestation of a *divine* ideal and also full humanity, because it is a divine ideal of *humanity*, perfectly embodied. Thus the perfection both of the divinity and of the humanity of Jesus is assured, in harmony with the creed of Chalcedon, and the unity of the person is also maintained. Dr. Relton thinks that this view is in harmony with modern psychology; but it would have been better for his argument if this portion of it had been omitted, for his chief reliance is upon Maher, and his own acquaintance with the results and methods of modern psychology is amusingly antiquated.

There is likewise an entertaining inability to appreciate the present conditions of theological thinking. Consequently it would be futile to push inquiries with regard to the details of the theory. What, for instance, was the "human nature" which found its hypostasis in the Logos? Was it merely corporeal? Then in accordance with the ancient view which the author appears to accept, it is the body of man alone which is saved. Does it include the soul? How then can it be impersonal, since "personality is and must be central, and the whole complex of attributes and qualities briefly described as human nature can have no existence apart from and except in vital union and relationship with a unifying and focal Ego as its subject" (p. 224)? That is, impersonal human nature is not human nature at all. Thus, however, the problem is upon us again in full force and Nestorianism is near. When we are told that "the divine Logos prior to the Incarnation already possessed everything needful to enable him to lead a truly human life" (p. 226), we recall several other passages in which the union of both soul and body is declared

essential for man, and wonder whether the Logos can then have been perfectly human prior to his incarnation. Moreover, the relationship between the ordinary human soul and the Logos presents difficulties. To insist as the author does upon the affinity between the human soul and the Logos opens a way to a quite different course of thought, according to which Christ is actually what all men are potentially, and this would lead to the conclusion that he is man manifest in the spirit rather than God manifest in the flesh.

But such questions of detail would be unprofitable. It is a wise saying in Selden's Table Talk, "The reason of a thing is not to be inquired after till you are sure the thing itself is so." Dr. Relton accepts without question the conclusions of Nicæa, and so faces a problem which he confesses ultimately insoluble. But a theory which gives rise to an insoluble problem arouses suspicion that the fault is with itself and not with the human mind. Only at the close of the book, and then most briefly, does the author deal with the facts which are supposed to make necessary the creeds of Nicæa and Chalcedon. Here he accepts the Fourth Gospel as of equal value with the Synoptists, and deals with the latter in thoroughly uncritical fashion. He even supposes that Consistent Eschatology tends to Orthodoxy since it emphasizes Jesus' thought of himself as the Messiah, without the faintest suspicion, apparently, that the content of that thought may be of such a character as to prove him in error. English-speaking Buddhists who transform Christian hymns into the praises of Buddha—"All hail the power of Buddha's name," for example—suggest that problems precisely similar to that with which Dr. Relton deals would arise with reference to other religious leaders in the world's history, provided the traditions concerning them are accepted as are the Christian traditions. Of course, by presupposing Nicæa and Chalcedon one may avoid this awkward predicament; but documents cannot be critically defended on the ground of conclusions derived from them uncritically accepted.

W. W. FENN.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.